REMARKS

Claims 1-58, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide an initialed copy of PTO Form 1449 indicating receipt and consideration of references accompanying an Information Disclosure Statement filed February 26, 2003.

Acknowledgement of applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, filed with certified copies of all priority documents, is also respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-18, 22, 23, 26-35, 37, 38 and 43-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Suzuki et al. U.S. Patent 6,469,431.

The presently claimed cathode ray tube comprises an elastic support member that is attached between the frame and the panel, thereby performing two functions: attaching the frame to the panel and suppressing vibrations of the frame. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action suggests that vibration attenuator 13 disclosed by Suzuki '431 allegedly corresponds to applicants'

elastic support member. However, the vibration attenuator 13 disclosed by Suzuki '431 attenuates the vibration of the shadow mask 10, not frame 11a, as explained next.

The vibration attenuator 13 disclosed by Suzuki '431 is <u>not</u> connected to both the frame and the panel, as recited in applicants' claims, but instead, has a "free end", i.e., the end opposite end 13a, described at column 11, line 13, as merely having a weight 20 attached thereto (see Suzuki '431, Fig. 10B), and is in direct contact with shadow mask 10 to absorb vibration generated therein and to attenuate it. Thus, because attenuator 13 has a free end, it is <u>not</u> connected to both the frame and the panel, as recited in applicants' claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Suzuki '431 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under \$102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Suzuki '431 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 2-16, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 1, claims

18-32, which depend from claim 17, are allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 17, and claims 34-58, which depend from claim 33, are allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 33. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 20, 21, 24, 25, 39-42 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Suzuki '431.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 1, claims 20, 21, 24, 25, which depend from claim 17, are allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 17, and claims 39-42 and 56-58, which depend from claim 33, are allowable for the same stated herein for claim 33. Accordingly, reasons and reconsideration withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 3, 19 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Suzuki '431 and Tokita et al. U.S. Patent 4,963,786.

Claim 3, which depends from claim 1, is allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 1, claim 19, which depends from claim 17, is allowable for the same reasons stated herein for claim 17, and claim 36, which depends from claim 33, is allowable for the same reasons stated herein as claim 33.

Moreover, the Office Action <u>admits</u> that Suzuki '431 does not disclose a v-shaped connection portion, and erroneously suggests that Tokita '786, Fig. 2, describes connection portion 22 as having a V-shaped configuration. Actually, Tokita '786, Fig. 2 shows connection portions 20a,b described at column 1, line 49, comprising metal plate 28 welded to bimetal strip 26 attached to mask frame 18a and stud 22 attached to panel 4. Tokita '786 does <u>not</u> teach a v-shaped connection portion, as recited in applicants' claims.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Suzuki '431 nor Tokita '786 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof

effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-58 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-58 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

July 2, 2003

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:105

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

1421 Prince Street, Suite 210

Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220